

the statute book. With respect to its educational scheme in particular, and its provision for the deserving poor, it remained merely a literary monument of the enlightenment and philanthropy of its authors. The result was a bitter disappointment to Knox, who gave vent to his indignation at the selfishness of many of these would-be Protestants in his usual blunt fashion. "Some [of the nobility] approved it, and willed the samyn have bene sett furth be a law. Otheris, perceaving thair carnall libertie and worldlie cornmoditie somewhat to be impaired thairby, grudged, insomuche that the name of the ' Book of Discipline' became odious unto thame. Everie thing that repugned to thair corrupt affectionis was termed in thair mockage, \* devote imaginationis.' The caus we have befoir declaired; some war licentious, some had greedelie gripped to the possessions of the Kirk, and otheris thought that thei wald nott lack thair part of Christis coat; yea, and that befoir that ever he was hanged, as by the Preachearis thei war oft rebuked." It would hardly be fair to accept implicitly Knox's animadversions even on his friends when they happened to cross his path. He was not the most charitable of critics of his own associates, let alone his theological opponents, and he is not always a safe exponent of motives. His personal disinterestedness is, however, above question, and the eagerness to " grip " the gear of the Church, which he lays to the charge of many of his lay brethren, is an ugly blot on their memory. The scramble for Church property was not, in fact, exclusively the fruit of the events of this memorable year 1560. It had been in progress, on various pretexts, directly or indirectly, long before the Reformation, and the Reformation only witnessed the climax of the policy of spoliation for personal ends. Worse still, these Protestant landgrabbers proved as heavy taskmasters of their new tenants as the miserable bishops and priests, who lived on the fat of the land at the poor man's expense. Knox's sermons might overthrow Antichrist; they certainly did not succeed in inaugurating the reign of righteousness for the oppressed masses.

Opposition to the "Book of Discipline" was, however, not necessarily actuated by sordid motives. The censorship over the individual and the community, which it would have estab-